

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the above-referenced patent application. Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,523,696 to Saito et al ("Saito"). The undersigned wishes to thank the Examiner for courtesies shown to Michael Zarrabian during telephone interview of Oct. 5, 2004, in which proposed amendments to the claims were discussed. As such, independent Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended to include limitations that are found in dependent claims 6 and 7, previously considered by the Examiner, and should therefore be entered. The amendments are to place the claims in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added.

Rejection of the claims is respectfully traversed because Saito does not disclose all of the limitations of the Claims. Regarding Claim 1, Saito does not disclose providing user interfaces in a first network including first devices interconnected via a communication medium and at least one interface device connecting said first network to at least a second network having interconnected second devices. Saito does not disclose obtaining graphical and/or textual information from the interface device about the second devices connected to the second network. Nor does Saito disclose obtaining information from said first devices currently connected to the first network wherein the information includes graphical and/or textual information.

The Examiner has interpreted Saito to disclose first and second network 203 connected by

an interface device 210, and obtaining information from devices connected to first and second networks (Fig. 7, col. 21, lines 5-10). However, in Fig. 7 and col. 18, line 48 to col. 19, line 5, Saito specifically shows a 1st HOME NETWORK and a 2nd HOME NETWORK. Saito does not disclose that the 1st HOME NETWORK and 2nd HOME NETWORK are connected by the PC 210. The PC 210 in the 2nd HOME NETWORK, is not an interface device as claimed. In col. 21, lines 41-49, Saito specifically states: “Now, the PC 210 is also connected to the home automation network 212 so that it also functions as a home automation server.... this PC 210 carries out controls of various devices (the air conditioner 213 and the microwave oven 214) connected to the home automation network 212....” In addition, in col. 21, lines 5-10 and lines 50-60, Saito does not disclose obtaining information from the interface device about the second devices connected to the second network, as claimed. There is no interface device in Saito as claimed herein.

Further, Saito does not disclose generating a user interface description in one or more of said first devices based at least on the obtained information, the user interface description including at least one graphical and/or textual reference of said first devices, and at least one graphical and/or textual reference of said second devices. The Examiner’s interpretation that Saito discloses such limitations is traversed. In Fig. 14, and col. 23, lines 12-23, Saito only states that FIG. 14 is a diagram showing an exemplary screen display in the case of device specific display in the network system of FIG. 7. As such, Fig. 14 shows a screen display, not a user interface description as claimed herein. As claimed herein, the user interface description is first

generated and then in another step, that user interface description is utilized to generate and display one or more user interfaces. Saito does not disclose such limitations, and the Patent Office has not shown where such a user interface description is taught by Saito.

Regarding Claim 4, Saito does not disclose that the interface device includes an address extension table for the second devices and that obtaining information from the interface device further includes the steps of using the address extension table to access said second devices. In col. 24, line 41 to col. 25, line 3, Saito discusses using port addresses in the PC 210 for the connecting devices 213 and 214, which is different from an address extension table because the port addresses in Saito do not form a table. Nor does not Saito teach an extension table that includes IP addresses for the second devices in the second network.

Regarding Claim 5, Saito does not disclose that the interface device is a bridge device. Saito has no mention of a bridge for connecting two different networks. Saito teaches away from using bridges (col. 12, lines 31 - 34 and col. 17, lines 43-57).

Regarding Claim 6, Saito does not disclose displaying one or more user interfaces each based on one of said one or more user interface descriptions, on one or more devices connected to the first network capable of displaying a user interface, for user control of said first and second devices. Saito does not teach generating a user interface description, and does not teach generating a user interface based on such a user interface description.

Regarding Claim 7, Saito does not disclose generating a user interface description as claimed, not does Saito teach displaying a user interface based on such a user interface description by using each reference in the corresponding user interface description to access the associated information in each device, generating the user interface including device data corresponding to each device using the accessed information in each device, and displaying the user interface on said device capable of displaying a user interface. In Fig. 14 and col. 23, lines 12-23, Saito simply shows generic screens where various network elements are each shown as a box with text therein. There is no disclosure in Saito of using a reference, such as a link, in a user interface description to access the device information of a device connected to the network, and then generate a user interface based on the accessed information for display, as claimed. Saito does not describe a mechanism of generating the various display screens that is even remotely similar to that claimed. If Claim 7 is once again rejected, Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office provide detailed explanation of how and where such limitations are disclosed in Saito.

Regarding Claim 8, Saito does not disclose generating a user interface description by associating a hyper-text link with the device information of one or more of said first and second devices, as required by Claim 1. The Examiner interprets Saito, col. 33, line 57 to col. 34, line 8, as disclosing such limitations. However, nowhere in Saito are such limitations disclosed. Saito simply describes a home page that may be reached through a hyperlink from an icon, and when

such an icon is clicked the home page of a corresponding device is displayed. Although Saito discusses a home page with icons, it does not disclose how the home page screen is generated. Saito only describes that a home page includes icons that when clicked show home page of a corresponding device. Saito does not describe generating a user interface description. Saito does not describe that the user interface description includes hyper-text links to information of the devices currently connected to the network. Saito does not disclose that the hyper-text links in the user interface description are used to access information associated with the devices currently connected to the network in order to generate a user interface for user interaction.

Regarding Claims 9 and 10, Saito does not disclose a user interface description. Further, Saito does not disclose that the user interface description includes references to device information of the devices currently connected to the network. Nor does Saito teach that the references in the user interface description are to user control interfaces in each corresponding device, wherein the user control interfaces are accessed using the references in the user interface description and shown on a display as a user interface. Fig. 14, col. 23, lines 12-23 and col. 25, lines 34-59 in Saito, simply describe a screen display, and does not in anyway disclose that the device information in a device includes a user control interface. Saito does not describe that the actual screen display is stored in a device connected to the network. Saito does not disclose that a device connected to the network has a specific user control interface therein, which is then accessed via a reference in a user interface description to generate a user interface that displays the specific user control interface of that device for user interaction.

Claims 11-27 were rejected for similar reasons as Claims 1-10, respectively. The rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reasons provided above in relation to Claims 1-10, respectively. Therefore, for at least these reasons, rejection of Claim 11-20 should be withdrawn. Further, claims 21-27 are allowable for similar reasons.

Conclusion

For these and other reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of the claims should be withdrawn, and all of the claims be allowed. Accordingly, reexamination, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 01-1960 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

MYERS DAWES ANDRAS & SHERMAN, LLP

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20591, on Oct 14, 2004
Alexandria VA
Date

By Kenneth L. Sherman
Oct 14, 2004
Date of Signature

Kenneth L. Sherman, Registration No. 33,783
19900 MacArthur Blvd., Ste. 1150
Irvine, CA 92612
(949) 223-9600